

**REMARKS**

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Terao, US Patent 6,651,167. Claims 8 and 10 are allowed.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for removing the double patenting rejection.

**Concise Explanation of Relevance**

The Examiner did not accept Applicant's previously submitted concise statement for relevance for the Sangyo reference. The Applicant now submits a new reference by Goldreich in the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement. The Sangyo reference is cumulative of the Goldreich reference. Therefore, the Examiner may consider the Goldreich reference in lieu of the Sangyo reference.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Terao, US Patent 6,651,167. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claim 1 recites that "the distinguisher evaluates the proof system depending on whether a difference in distribution between the proof history and the simulated proof history is computationally indistinguishable for a great majority of possible common inputs and computationally distinguishable for at least one of the possible common inputs." This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Terao. Terao does not disclose a difference in distribution between the proof

history and the simulated proof history. Terao also fails to disclose evaluation of computational distinguishability or indistinguishability of such a distribution. The Examiner points to lines 1-17 of column 4 of Terao for this feature; however, this portion merely explains in general terms the general functioning of the ticket issuing system of Terao. There is nothing in this portion of Terao, or in any other portion of Terao, that teaches or suggests a difference in distribution between the proof history and the simulated proof history as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is patentable over Terao at least due to this difference, as well as additionally recited features. Claims 7, 9 and 11 recite analogous features, and thus are patentable over Terao for analogous reasons. The remaining rejected claims are patentable at least due to their dependencies.

#### **Allowed Claims**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 8 and 10 are allowed.

#### **Amendment to the Specification**

The specification as reproduced by the USPTO has been amended to more accurately reflect the specification submitted by Applicant.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/718,663

Attorney Docket No.: Q78522

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl J. Pellegrini  
Registration No. 40,766

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 24, 2008